



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,261	02/17/2000	Dennis Palatov	MGANO-010A	7408

7590 06/30/2006

BRIAN M. BERLINER, Esq.
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2899

EXAMINER

TRAN, HAI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/506,261	PALATOV ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hai Tran	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-29,35,51 and 57-61 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30,32-34,36-50,52-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/05/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 has been received and recorded. Thus, the Examiner withdraws the rejection of Claims 30, 32-34, 36-50 and 52-56 based on Abecassis (US 6192340).

In view of Applicants' remark and amended claims, the Examiner takes note; however, they are not persuasive because Applicant does not explain reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the references of record. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Allen discloses a model of

Art Unit: 2623

distributing movie content via a Kiosk in which the purchasing/renting movie is copied onto a portable storage media, i.e. digital video tape, VHS tape or Digital Video Disk.

Allen also discloses that the returned portable storage media, during subsequent visit to the kiosk, can be refurbished for future use, i.e., recording another movie content for next transaction.

Applicants further argue that Allen's movie distribution model is unacceptable to movie content producers because it's not secure.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant because Allen's movie distribution model may be unacceptable to Applicant's opinion, however, Allen's reference does not exclude that Allen's invention itself could not be modified or improved by one of ordinary skill in the art. In view of that Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Applicant further argues, "During subsequent visit to this or a similar kiosk, the customer has option of reusing the portable storage device, which is not disclosed by any of the prior art references."

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants because it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., During subsequent visit to this or a similar kiosk, the customer has option of reusing the portable storage device) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant further argues, "Allen fails to disclose a portable storage device that is manually inserted into the receptacle of the kiosk and that permits repeated reuse."

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants because the Examiner does not see how a user could return the portable storage device to the Kiosk without manually inserted it into the receptacle of the kiosk so that the Kiosk able to check if indeed the portable storage device did return correctly. Allen further discloses that the returned portable storage device is refurbished (repeated reuse; see Col. 24, lines 1-15).

Applicant further argues, "Allen does not suggest any need for encryption—indeed, ...The only such teaching or suggestion for the combination comes from the present invention. It is therefore improper to combine the references as proposed."

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Allen discloses that distributed movie content stored on a portable storage device is unsecured in which any user could reproduce the stored movie content with ease. On the other hand, Tatebayashi teaches a method of securely stored video content on a portable video content storage for preventing of unauthorized access using one of the pluralities of

Art Unit: 2623

authentication/encryption protocols. In view of that, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify Allen's system to configure the kiosk to securely store video content on the portable storage device for the benefit of preventing the stored video content to be distributed to unauthorized devices, as taught by Tatebayashi (Col. 1, lines 47-50).

Applicant further argues, "claim 30, as presently amended, further clarifies that the connection between the storage device and the kiosk and the storage device and the set-top box are via a physical connector 'incompatible with industry standard computer systems.' This has the added advantage of securing the content on the device and limiting illegitimate use of the device without the requirement for encoding algorithms for security."

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's reasons and believes that Applicant's motivation is not very convincing because it's notoriously well known of having a device with proprietary connectors for many other reasons beside of Applicants' motivation, such as forcing user must use/purchase the portable storage device that correspond to make and model of the currently own.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 30, 32-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen (US 5909638) in view of Tatebayashi (US 6182215), and further in view of Abecassis (US 5610653), and further in view of Russo (US 5619247) and further in view of Okuyama et al. (US 5987126) and further in view of Darden et al (US 4941841).

Regarding claim 30, Allen discloses a system for distributing video content (Fig. 1, Abstract), the system comprising:

An interactive kiosk configured to be located in a public location (fig. 16) (Col. 22, lines 15-40), the kiosk further configured to receive and access/read/write the data/video into a variety of content storage *device* (VHS videotape, recordable laser disk or DVD, etc..., see Col. 1, lines 25-32 and Col 5, lines 50-55). Moreover, Allen further suggests that the Kiosk comprises a 1st receptacle configured to receive the storage device (Col. 24, lines 1-5) and an input device for receiving input from user (Col. 21, lines 10-25) in which the kiosk is configured to store video content on the storage device in response to the user input. Allen further discloses the Kiosk able to read "tracking information" from the return of the content storage device's rental (Col. 8, lines 41-53). Allen further discloses a durable housing configured to contain and protect the memory/medium (Col. 18, lines 21-28).

Allen does not clearly disclose the housing of the portable storage device comprising an external 1st physical connector in which the kiosk is configured to

have a 2nd physical connector adapted to mate with the 1st connector of the portable storage device.

Allen further does not clearly disclose the kiosk further configures to securely store video content on the portable video content storage device upon which digitally encoded video content is securely stored to prevent unauthorized access;

Allen further does not clearly disclose the storage device comprising a memory capable of storing at least MPEG-2 quality video content, a security module that connects with and limits access to the memory; Allen does not clearly disclose the kiosk further configures to read the accumulated content use data from the storage device;

Allen further does not clearly disclose a set-top box (STB) comprising a 2nd receptacle configured to receive the portable video content storage device via a 3rd physical connector adapted to mate with the 1st connector, to access/write the securely stored video content from the portable video content storage device and to provide the video content as an output signal to a video display; and at last,

Allen does not clearly disclose the STB further configured to accumulate content use data and to store the accumulated content use data directly onto the storage device, and the 1st, 2nd and 3rd connectors are incompatible with industry standard computer systems.

Tatebayashi describes a method to securely store video content on the portable video content storage device upon which digitally encoded video content is securely stored (using encryption method to store information/data on the portable

device) for preventing unauthorized access by using authentication protocol (Col. 5, lines 65-Col. 6, lines 11). Tatebayashi further discloses a set-top box comprising a 2nd receptacle (Fig., 2; elements 101 and Fig. 5, element 101 as a broadcast satellite receiver; see col. 10, lines 15-47) configures to receive the portable video content storage device to access the securely stored video content from the portable video content storage device and to provide the video content as an output signal to a video display (Once, the authentication protocol is verified, the access is authorized to perform any functions required to display necessary on any display device; i.e., TV, computer monitor). The process of authentication is done by a security module that connects with and limits access to the memory (Col. 16, lines 21-63); It is noted that "A portable video content storage devices" is defined as any portable apparatus that store data/video information and it could be carried by users; i.e., portable VCR/DVD/CD device, VHS tape, CD/DVD disk or cartridge medium, PCs, Laptop, PCMCIA card with integrated storage, etc... Fig., 2; elements 104, 105, 106, 102, 103 and Fig. 4, element 104). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen's system to securely configure the kiosk to securely store video content on the portable video content storage and to prevent unauthorized access to stored video content on the portable video content storage device, as taught by Tatebayashi, so to prevent the video productions/recording from being distributed to unauthorized devices (Col. 1, lines 47-50).

Allen in view of Tatebayashi discloses a set-top box (Tatebayashi; Fig., 2; elements 101 and Fig. 5, element 101 as a broadcast satellite receiver; see col. 10, lines 15-47) configures to receive the portable video content storage device, i.e., DVD-RAM, connects to the set-top box, but not removable from within the set-top box .

Allen in view of Tatebayashi does not clearly disclose the Kiosk and the set-top box is configured to have the portable video content storage device comprising a memory capable of storing at least MPEG-2 quality video content, the portable video content storage device as removable storage device, i.e. removable hard disk, CompactFlash, Smartmedia... and Allen in view of Tatebayashi further does not disclose that the kiosk configures to read the accumulated content use data from the storage device, the STB further configures to accumulate content use data and to store the accumulated content use data directly onto the storage device.

Abecassis' 653 discloses a removable drive/compact portable storage could be implemented in a set-top box or any system (see Fig. 5, el. 504 and 505; Col. 18, lines 60-65 and Col. 19, lines 24-50) and the set-top box are configured to decode MPEG-2 quality video content (Col. 20, lines 46-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen and Tatebayashi with Abecassis' 653 so to provide to user to use a wide variety of removable device that are available on the market in which the user could plug and play the removable device to any system, i.e., set-top box, Kiosk ...that

Art Unit: 2623

user would like to write/read data between the removable device and the system connected.

Allen in view of Tatebayashi and Abecassis' 653 discloses the set-top box do not clearly disclose the Kiosk and the set-top box are configured to have the portable video content storage device comprising a memory capable of storing at least MPEG-2 quality video content, the kiosk configures to read the accumulated content use data from the storage device, and the STB further configures to accumulate content use data and to store the accumulated content use data directly onto the storage device.

Russo discloses a set-top box control access to a secured data content of a storage medium 110 and is configured to accumulate present content use data and to write the accumulate present content use data to the storage medium 110 (Col. 10, lines 10-65+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen, Tatebayashi and Abecassis' 653 with Russo to accumulate and write content use data, as suggested by Russo, to the removable-portable storage device so to keep track the usage of users for billing purposes (Col. 3, lines 15-30). Furthermore, in view of all the teaching of Allen, Tatebayashi and Abecassis' 653 with Russo, it would have been obvious that Allen 's kiosk would be able to read content use data (tracking information) from the return of the content storage device's rental so the billing process at the kiosk able to give back credit or reduce charge to user for the

percentage of the video content that has not been viewed by the user as suggested by Russo (Col. 5, lines 35-65).

Allen in view of Tatebayashi, Abecassis' 653 and Russo does not clearly disclose the Kiosk and the set-top box is configured to have the portable video content storage device comprising a memory capable of storing at least MPEG-2 quality video content.

Okuyama discloses a system able to copy/store/write MPEG-2 format content data onto the storage media (Col. 14, lines 16-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen in view of Tatebayashi, Abecassis' 653 and Russo with Okuyama to have a media storage able to store MPEG-2 format, as suggested by Okuyama, so to increase the capacity of the storage media by taking the advantage of the well known MPEG standard. Moreover, reduce the time of copying the media content onto the media storage by not performing a format conversion, i.e., digital (MPEG-2) to analog.

Allen in view of Tatebayashi, Abecassis' 653, Russo and Okuyama does not clearly disclose the housing of the portable storage device comprising an external 1st physical connector in which the kiosk is configured to have a 2nd physical connector adapted to mate with the 1st connector of the portable storage device; Allen in view of Tatebayashi, Abecassis' 653, Russo and Okuyama further does not clearly disclose the set-top box (STB) configured to receive the portable video content storage device via a 3rd physical connector adapted to mate with the 1st connector,

Art Unit: 2623

and the 1st, 2nd and 3rd connectors are incompatible with industry standard computer systems.

Darden discloses an adapter with an external connector (Fig. 2, el. 130) adapted to mate with the external connector (Fig. 2, el. 88) of the removable slide-in storage device (cartridge) wherein the external connectors are incompatible with industry standard computer systems (Col. 10, lines 33-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen in view of Tatebayashi, Abecassis' 653, Russo and Okuyama to modify Allen's kiosk and Abecassis'653 set-top terminal with Darden 's adapter and cartridge so to provide a versatile removable storage media which the removable storage device could be temporarily connected and remove it from the connected device for security and portability purposes, i.e., the removable storage device could be remove and place in a safe place, as suggested by Darden (Col. 2, lines 14-18 and lines 32-40) .

Regarding claim 32, Tatebayashi further discloses wherein the storage device consists essentially of passive storage media unit (Col. 8, lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 33, both Tatebayashi (Col. 5, lines 65-Col. 6, lines 11) and Russo (Fig. 2, el. 114; Col. 7, lines 55-61 and Col. 10, lines 10-23) disclose encoded

Art Unit: 2623

video content stored on the storage device is encrypted to prevent unauthorized access.

Regarding claims 34 and 36, the method of claims 34 and 36 is analyzed with respect to apparatus claim 30.

2. Claims 37- 43 and 45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen (US 5909638) in view of Tatebayashi (US 6182215), and further in view of Abecassis (US 5610653), and further in view of Russo (US 5619247) and further in view of Okuyama et al. (US 5987126) and further in view of Darden et al (US 4941841) and further in view of Cantone (US 5734781).

Regarding claim 37, the hand-held dedicated secure video content storage device is analyzed with respect to claim 30. The physical connector mounted in the housing of Tatebayashi' s devices (Fig. 1, 2; elements 104, 105, 106, 102, 103) is obvious to be removable configured to connect/disconnect to the Kiosk.

Furthermore, removable drive suggested by Abecassis' 653 must also have physical connector mounted in the housing of the removable drive. Russo further discloses a controller configured to prevent unauthorized access to the mass storage module, the controller further configured to permit video content to be written to the mass storage module.

“wherein the physical connector is configured to be uniquely compatible with the kiosk but incompatible with industry standard electronic system and devices for accessing video content” reads on Kiosk’ s Allen removable storage receptacle slot is modified with Darden’s adapter with an external connector (Fig. 2, el. 130) adapted to mate with the external connector (Fig. 2, el. 88) of the removable slide-in storage device (cartridge) wherein the external connectors are incompatible with industry standard computer systems (Col. 10, lines 33-45).

Abecassis’ 653 does not clearly disclose removable drive housing suggested containing a controller.

Cantone discloses a removable drive housing containing a controller (Fig. 1, el. 22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen, Tatebayashi, Abecassis’ 653, Russo and Darden with Cantone to have a controller built-in the removable drive housing so to control all the functions pertaining to that device such as to protect/ prevent authorized access to the removable-portable (handheld) storage device in case of lost or misplaced.

Regarding claim 38, Tatebayashi’ s devices (Fig. 1, 2; elements 104, 105, 106, 102, 103) further discloses wherein the communication port comprises an electrical connector (fig., element 107). Furthermore, removable drive suggested by Abecassis’ 340 must also have “the communication port comprises an electrical

connector” and Darden shows the communication port of the removable storage media and adapter comprises an electrical connector (Col. 11, lines 25-45).

Regarding claim 39, Tatebayashi fails to show the communication port comprise an optical connector.

Official Notice is taken that the use of an optical connector is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tatebayashi by including an optical connector so to provide a more choice of connectivity between devices.

Regarding claims 40, Tatebayashi further discloses an authentication scheme to communicate with only devices that have a reference authentication table pre-configured (Col. 5, lines 65-Col. 6, lines 60).

Regarding claim 41, see analysis of claim 30 in combination with claim 40.

Regarding claim 42, Tatebayashi's devices (Fig. 1, 2; elements 104, 105, 106, 102, 103) all have a disk drive.

Regarding claim 43, with the teaching of Tatebayashi ' authentication protocols (Col. 8, lines 15-65+), Tatebayashi clearly encompass the claimed limitation “configured to separately limit read and write access to the disk drive”.

Regarding claim 44, Abecassis ' 653 (Col. 25, lines 26-50) further disclose wherein the controller comprises a data buffer configured to buffer data as the data is transferred to or from the disk drive. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen, Tatebayashi, Abecassis ' 653, Russo, Okuyama and Cantone to have a data buffer

configured to buffer data as the data is transferred to or from the disk drive, as taught by Abecassis' 653, so to retrieve subsequent from information from the video disk without altering the transmission of the required frames per second to provide a transparently continuous video signal transmission, as suggested by Abecassis' 653 (Col. 23, lines 59-65).

Regarding claim 45, see analysis of claim 30.

Regarding claims 46 and 47, Abecassis' 653 further discloses the controller is configured to limit access to the mass storage module based at least upon a content rating of a content unit and a set of user preference relating to the format content units to be stored on the mass storage module (Col. 28, lines 40-Col. 29, lines 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Allen, Tatebayashi, Abecassis' 653, Russo Okuyama and Cantone with the teaching of Abecassis' 653 so to limit access to the mass storage module based at least upon a content rating of a content unit so to provide a video program that is highly responsive to viewer control over its content (see Col. 29, lines 47-52).

3. Claims 48-50, and 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (US 5610653) in view of Russo (US 5619247) and further in view of Darden et al (US 4941841).

Regarding claim 48, Abecassis' 653 discloses a set-top box for accessing video content stored on a portable video content storage device, the set-top box comprising:

A receptacle configured to manually receive the portable video content storage device, wherein the portable video content storage device can be inserted and removed by a user (see Fig. 5, el. 504 and 505; Col. 18, lines 60-65 and Col. 19, lines 24-50);

A video decoder module configured to decode the video content to produce an output signal; and a processor configured to control the video decoder module (Col. 20, lines 42-Col. 21, lines 25)

Abecassis' 653 does not clearly disclose a processor configured to accumulate present content use data based at least upon an amount use of the video content and to store the accumulated content use data onto the portable video content storage device. Abecassis further does not clearly disclose that the set-top 's receptacle comprises an external 1st physical connector incompatible with industry standard computer system and "wherein the set top box is configured to be uniquely connected to the portable video content storage device via a 2nd physical connector incompatible with industry standard devices for transferring video content, the connector being adapted to mate with the 1st connector."

Russo discloses a set-top box control access to a secured data content of a storage medium 110 and is configured to write content use data to the storage medium 110 (Col. 10, lines 10-65+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abecassis' 653 with Russo to accumulate and write content use data, as suggested by Russo, to the removable-portable storage device so to keep track the usage of users for billing purposes (Col. 3, lines 15-30).

Abecassis' 653 in view of Russo does not clearly disclose that the set-top 's receptacle comprises an external 1st physical connector incompatible with industry standard computer system and "wherein the set top box is configured to be uniquely connected to the portable video content storage device via a 2nd physical connector incompatible with industry standard devices for transferring video content, the connector being adapted to mate with the 1st connector."

Darden discloses an adapter with an external connector (Fig. 2, el. 130) adapted to mate with the external connector (Fig. 2, el. 88) of the removable slide-in storage device (cartridge) wherein the external connectors are incompatible with industry standard computer systems (Col. 10, lines 33-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abecassis' 653 and Russo to modify Abecassis'653 set-top terminal removable storage media with Darden 's adapter and removable storage media cartridge so to provide a versatile removable storage media which the removable storage device could be temporarily connected and remove it from the connected device for security and portability purposes, i.e., the removable storage device could be remove and place in a safe place, as suggested by Darden (Col. 2, lines 14-18 and lines 32-40) .

Regarding claim 49, Abecassis' 653 further discloses wherein the processor is further configured to control the portable video content storage device (see Fig. 5 with CPU 511,513 in which control the operation of the system as disclosed in Col. 28, lines 40-Col. 29, lines 42).

Regarding claim 50, Russo further discloses a decryption module (Fig. 2, element 114 "Descramble").

Regarding claim 53, Abecassis '653 further discloses wherein the output signal comprises video information and audio information (see Fig. 4).

Regarding claims 54-56, Abecassis '653 (Col. 28, lines 40-Col. 29, lines 42).
in view of Russo further disclose wherein the processor is further configured to access user preferences stored on the portable video content storage device based at least upon a content rating of the content unit and to modify the user references.

Art Unit: 2623

4. Claims 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (US 5610653) in view of Russo (US 5619247) and further in view of Darden et al (US 4941841) and further in view of Tatebayashi (US 6182215

Regarding Claim 52, Abecassis '653 in view of Russo and Darden does not clearly disclose the STB comprising an authentication module configured to provide authentication information to the portable video content storage device.

Tatebayashi discloses an STB's authentication module configured to provide authentication information to the portable video content storage device (Fig. 5; elements 101 and Fig., 2; elements 104, 105, 106, 102, 103) for preventing the video productions/recording from being distributed to unauthorized devices (Col. 1, lines 47-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Abecassis '653 in view of Russo and Darden to securely configure the STB for unauthorized access to stored video content on the storage device, as taught by Tatebayashi, so to prevent the video productions/recording from being distributed to unauthorized devices (Col. 1, lines 47-50).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7305. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 2623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HT:ht
06/23/2006


HAITRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER